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Reviewer's report:

Major comments:

1. line 96-115
Authors conceptualized social capital as an individual attribute, then the distinction between social capital and social support should be clarified more extensively.

2. significance level
Significance level should be defined just one. Author stated that they calculated 95% Confidence Intervals in method section (line 183-184), however, in additional file 1 they described “*p<0.05, **p<0.01”.
And they should also show exact p-values not levels.

3. Authors stated that civic engagement were associated with moratality in men, but not in women. However, the HRs are exactly the same in the adjusted model (Model B). This interpretation was heavily dependent only on significance testing and over simplified. They shold consider another possibilities, e.g., Type II error, even though the sample size was relatively big (Why the CI for civic engagement in women was wider compared to other dimensions?).

4. Line 256-258
The negative effect for social network for men, so-called ‘dark side’ of socical capital (and social support, of course, it should be also cosider comment 1) should be paid more attention. And authors should cite several porevious studies (e.g., Ikeda A, 2011; Kobayashi T, 2014, and so on) and discuss more. And if possible, they should add the discussions on the dimensions on bonding/bridging social capital.


Minor comments:

5. Tables
Authors should not use vertical lines in tables.

6. Table 1
Horizontal line should be added in ‘civic engagement’.

7. Table 3
Authors should align significance digits.

8. Figure 3
An arrow for specifying lower CI limit for civic engagement in female (Model A) should be removed.

9. references
Ref 20 and ref 21 are the same one, it should be corrected.

10. line 220
Table 2 might be Table 3. (And p-values should be described more digits according to comment 6).
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